

EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

CIVIL ACTION NO. 9:23-CV-49

DIRECTOR, TDCJ-ID,

Respondent.

The court has conducted a *de novo* review of the objections in relation to the pleadings and the applicable law. After careful consideration, the court is of the opinion the objections are without merit. Inmates charged with prison disciplinary offenses are entitled to certain procedural safeguards when the punishment imposed implicates a protected liberty interest. *Sandin v. Connor*, 515 U.S. 472, 483-84 (1995). Petitioner is not eligible for release on mandatory supervision. As a result, the magistrate judge correctly concluded the punishment petitioner received did not implicate a protected liberty interest and that he was therefore not entitled to any procedural safeguards.


ORDER

Accordingly, petitioner's objections (#6) are **OVERRULED**. The findings of fact and conclusions of law of the magistrate judge are correct and the report of the magistrate judge (#3) is **ADOPTED**. A final judgment will be entered denying the petition.

Furthermore, the court is of the opinion petitioner is not entitled to a certificate of appealability. An appeal from a final judgment denying habeas relief may not proceed unless a judge issues a certificate of appealability. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253. The standard for a certificate of appealability requires the petitioner to make a substantial showing of the denial of a federal constitutional right. *See Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 483-84 (2000). In order to make a substantial showing, the petitioner need not establish that he would prevail on the merits. Rather, he must demonstrate that the issues raised in the petition are subject to debate among jurists of reason, that a court could resolve the issues in a different manner, or that the questions presented are worthy of encouragement to proceed further. *See Slack*, 529 U.S. at 483-84. Any doubt regarding whether to grant a certificate of appealability should be resolved in favor of the petitioner, and the severity of the penalty may be considered in making this determination. *See Miller v. Johnson*, 200 F.3d 274, 280-81 (5th Cir. 2000).

In this case, the petitioner has not shown that the issues raised are subject to debate among jurists of reason. The factual and legal questions raised by petitioner have been consistently resolved adversely to his position and the questions presented are not worthy of encouragement to proceed further. Petitioner has failed to make a sufficient showing to merit the issuance of a certificate of appealability. Thus, a certificate of appealability will not be issued.

SIGNED at Beaumont, Texas, this 10th day of April, 2024.



MARCIA A. CRONE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE